REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-14 are pending within this application. Claims 13-14 are newly added herein. No claims have been allowed.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102 & 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-7 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,799; hereinafter "Robertson").

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson.

The Examiner reads Robertson's Figs. 1-2 onto applicant's claims 1 and 7, and concludes that all limitations within claims 1 and 7 are taught within Robertson.

With respect to claims 2 and 8, which are directed towards various microelectronic fabrication facilities within which may be practiced applicant's invention, the Examiner takes official notice of applicability of Robertson's invention to those types of microelectronic fabrication facilities.

In response with respect to claims 2 and 8, applicant notes that Robertson within the last sentence within col. 6 teaches that "[i]n another embodiment, the portal site 104 connects

end users 102 to a foundry or semiconductor manufacturers." Thus, applicant understands Robertson to teach Robertson's invention within the context of a semiconductor fabrication facility in accord with applicant's claimed invention. For this reason, applicant suggests that claims 2 and 8 might also plausibly be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson, and need not necessarily require the Examiner's official notice. Further for this reason, applicant predicates patentability of applicant's claims 2 and 8 upon their dependence upon claims 1 or 7.

With respect to claims 1 and 7, Robertson also teaches within the sentence bridging cols. 6-7 that "[t]he portal site may facilitate the search for a suitable foundry or semiconductor manufacturing facility, by providing a database of such, and by attempting to match up the end user 102 with the most suitable foundries or manufacturing facilities." Robertson within the first paragraph on page 7 also teaches that "[t]he portal site 104 provides views into the compatibility of component suppliers 106 with one another and with the standards utilized by specific foundries or semiconductor manufacturers, thus allowing the end users 102 to select appropriate upstream component suppliers 106 early in the design process."

In accord with Robertson's foregoing teachings within the paragraph bridging cols. 6-7, Robertson's electronic circuit and chip design information system is clearly intended to assist a microelectronic product customer with proper selection of a semiconductor foundry prior to placement of a microelectronic product order with a semiconductor foundry. Robertson's electronic circuit and chip design information system is clearly of value for purposes of electronic circuit and chip design prior to production of microelectronic products.

In comparison, applicant within claim 1 and claim 7 claims a microelectronic fabrication facility information system comprising "a series of databases having contained therein production information for microelectronic fabrication product orders within a microelectronic fabrication facility. . . ." Thus, applicant clearly discloses and claims a microelectronic fabrication facility information system operational after a customer order has been received and accepted for a particular microelectronic product, while Robertson teaches a related but unanticipating microelectronic fabrication facility information system operational prior to receiving and accepting a customer order.

Since Robertson's invention is thus clearly directed towards an electronic circuit and chip design information system that is employed and operational prior to order and production of a microelectronic product, while applicant's invention is directed towards a related but patentably distinct microelectronic fabrication facility information system that is operational after a microelectronic product order has been placed, applicant asserts that claim 1 and claim 7 may not properly be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson. At minimum, applicant asserts that databases for which a microelectronic product manufacturer would provide access to a potential customer in accord with Robertson (i.e., production capabilities databases) are not the same as databases for which a microelectronic product manufacturer would provide to an existing customer (i.e., actual production databases). Since at minimum the databases are different, applicant asserts that applicant's invention as disclosed and claimed within claims 1 and 7 are clearly not anticipated by Robertson.

Since all remaining claims within this application are dependent upon claims 1 or 7 and carry all of the limitations of claims 1 or 7, applicant additionally asserts that those

remaining claims may also not properly be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson.

In light of the foregoing responses, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections of: (1) claims 1, 3-7 and 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson; and (2) claims 2 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, be withdrawn.

Other Considerations

Applicant has newly added claims 13-14 as directed towards applicant's microelectronic fabrication customer accessing applicant's production information for a product order being produced for applicant's microelectronic fabrication customer. The foregoing limitation is intended to provide greater clarity to applicant's claimed invention. The foregoing limitation finds support within applicant's specification at paragraph 0017 (page 5, lines 15-20), wherein applicant discloses that "[a] microelectronic fabrication product order status is readily available to a microelectronic fabrication customer for whom the microelectronic fabrication product is fabricated" within applicant's method and system that provides a microelectronic fabrication order status when fabricating a microelectronic fabrication.

The Examiner has cited no additional prior art of record not employed in rejecting applicant's claims to applicant's invention. No fee is due as a result of this amendment and response.

SUMMARY

Applicant's invention as disclosed and claimed within claim 1 and claim 7 is directed towards a microelectronic fabrication facility information system that provides for customer access to databases therein after a customer order has been placed and customer order production is ensuing. Absent from the prior art of record employed in rejecting applicant's claims to applicant's invention is a teaching of each and every limitation within applicant's claimed invention.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of this application, and its early allowance, are respectfully requested.

Any inquiries relating to this or earlier communications pertaining to this application may be directed to the undersigned attorney at 248-540-4040.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy W. Tung (Reg. No. 31,311)

838 West Long Lake Road - Suite 120
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302
248-540-4040 (voice)
248-540-4035 (facsimile)